

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. The above amendments to claims 1, 5, 11, 16-21, 23, and 28-30 find support in the specification and claims as originally filed, see for example, page 8, lines 8-10 and page 23, lines 13-20, of the specification. No new matter is presented.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,523 to Siegel. The rejection is traversed.

Claims 1-30 distinguish patentably over Siegel. Applicant submits that the claimed invention and the system and method taught by Siegel are different and are directed to solving different problems. Siegel is directed to a method for the auditory navigation of on-screen textual information by a person who understands the on-screen language in its spoken form, but who cannot read. See Siegel, Abstract. Specifically, this is done by using minimal phonetic or phonemic bits of language to create a set of text entries which may be perused by the user. See Siegel, column 3, lines 1-18. This presumes that the user can understand the spoken language and thus the Siegel system is used to allow a non-literate person to navigate text, thereby enabling a non-literate user to accomplish things such as navigating to and selecting text entries of interest, navigating and implementing text-based on-screen control functions, selecting words for use in writing a story, etc. See column 4, lines 1-15.

In the "talking dictionary" embodiment of Siegel, discussed beginning at column 4, the user with minimal reading ability may navigate to words in a multimedia dictionary. In a web browser embodiment of Siegel, discussed beginning at column 18, the same navigation techniques used in the talking dictionary are used to search and navigate to web pages.

The present invention, on the other hand, is directed to a language instruction program for assisting a user in learning to speak a language. There is no requirement that the user understands the on-screen language in spoken form and,

in fact, typically would not, particularly in the case of foreign language instruction. This is achieved by providing a prerecorded digital recording of the on-screen words as an embedded object in a HTML page and playing the recording in response to a mouse rollover event. Rather than using rollover events to generate lists and to navigate a textual hierarchy as taught by Siegel, the present invention allows the user to cause playback of the recordings as necessary or desired to learn to pronounce the on-screen words.

Siegel fails to teach each and every claim limitation of claims 1-30. It is well established that, to be anticipatory, a reference must disclose each and every claim limitation. While not intended to be an exhaustive list of all of the differences between the subject invention and the teachings of Siegel, there is no teaching or suggestion by Siegel to employ a web object containing the prerecorded digital recordings embedded in an HTML page.

With respect to claims 4, 5, 8-11, 19, and 26, there is also no teaching of a bilingual system. With respect to claims 7, 9, 12, and 13, there is no teaching or suggestion that each word of a multiword phrase or sentence be individually selectable. With respect to claim 15, there is no teaching or suggestion of using a touch-screen overlay. With respect to claim 16, there is no teaching or suggestion in Siegel of extending a rollover region a predetermined number of pixels below an on-screen word. With respect to claims 20-29, there is no teaching or suggestion of a method for developing a language instruction system. With respect to 21-23, there is no teaching or suggestion of the recited method employing a Flash document.

Because of the above-noted deficiencies in the cited prior art, a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claims 1-30 has not been established. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

## PRIOR ART CITED AND NOT RELIED UPON

Applicant will not burden the record with a discussion of the prior art cited but not relied upon.

## CONCLUSION

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention and the Siegel patent upon which the rejection in the Office action relies. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable from, and thereby allowable over, the prior art.

Allowance of all claims and early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

McLANE, GRAF, RAULERSON &  
MIDDLETON, P.A.



Scott C. Rand; Reg. No. 40,359  
900 Elm St., P.O. Box 326  
Manchester, NH 03105-0326  
(603) 625-6464 (tel)  
(603) 625-5650 (fax)

Dated: September 21, 2004